

REVIEW HISTORY

Paper: **“The Status of the Humanities in The 21st Century: A Case Study”**

Corresponding Author: Nitza Davidovitch

Email: d.nitza@ariel.ac.il

Doi: 10.19044/ejes.v7no3a9

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Mary Ann Hollingsworth
University of West Alabama, USA

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Published: 30.09.2020

EJES Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: EJES promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

EJES editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands EJES out from the crowd!

| | |
|---|--|
| Reviewer Name: Dr. Mary Ann Hollingsworth | Email: ahollingsworth@uwa.edu |
| University/Country: University of West Alabama, United States | |
| Date Manuscript Received: June 3, 2020 | Date Review Report Submitted: June 5, 2020 |
| Manuscript Title: The status of the humanities in the 21 st century: Spiritual assets | |
| Manuscript Number: | |
| You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No | |
| You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No | |
| You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No | |

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.



| <i>Questions</i> | <i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent] |
|---|--|
| 1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article. | 5 |
| <i>The title does reflect the context of the article.</i> | |
| 2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results. | 5 |
| <i>The abstract accurately summarizes the paper.</i> | |
| 3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. | |
| <i>On pages 2 and 4, there were some paragraphs that were only one sentence. These could be grouped together more effectively.</i> | |
| 4. The study methods are explained clearly. | 4 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> | |
| 5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors. | 3 |
| <i>On page 14, there is a reference to “figure 3) but no figures are included in the paper. There was not consistency with paragraphs being indented.</i> | |
| 6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content. | 4 |
| <i>The conclusion did seem to reflect accurately the content of the paper.</i> | |
| 7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate. | 3 |
| <i>There are places where additional citation support would strengthen the discussion – such as page 5 with <i>The humanities: spiritual assets</i>.</i> | |

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :



| | |
|--|---|
| Accepted, no revision needed | |
| Accepted, minor revision needed | X |
| Return for major revision and resubmission | |
| Reject | |

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

It would be helpful to correct those places where noted in the feedback above.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

This article has very pertinent content to reflect on and hopefully will encourage further research on the focus of the content.